



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,081	07/24/2003	Yoshio Sasaki	B-5163 621099-6	3130
36716	7590	03/19/2007	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY			GUPTA, PARUL H	
5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679			2627	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/627,081	SASAKI ET AL.
	Examiner Parul Gupta	Art Unit 2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4,5 and 7-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4,5 and 7-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
|--|--|

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7-12 are pending for examination as interpreted by the examiner. The amendment and arguments filed on 2/26/07 were considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 11, and 12 recite the limitation "pit ratio" in each claim. The pit ratio is never explained further. Although it is calculated, there is no indication of what it is used for. In addition, the claim should read "a pit ratio" as opposed to "the pit ratio" since it is not mentioned previously. Claims 4, 5, and 7-10 are dependent on these rejected independent claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Double Patenting

3. Claims 1, 11, and 12 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 7 of U.S. Patent Application 10/627131. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the reasons stated below.

Claims 1, 11, and 12 recite as the inventive feature, detecting "a pit level ... and at least one of a read level and a write level, wherein the pit level represents a level of

Art Unit: 2627

the optical beam reflected from the from the optical disk while the optical beam is forming a pit during the test recording operation" which is the same as claims 1 and 7 of the patent application.

It is clear that all the elements of claims 1, 11, and 12 are to be found in claims 1 and 7. The difference between claims 1 and 7 of the application and claims 1, 11, and 12 of the patent application lies in the fact that the patent application claims include recording data as opposed to laser calibration. Thus, it would be obvious to test record before recording in order to perform the function of accurately calibrating the laser. Therefore, claims 1, 11, and 12 are not patentably distinct from claims 1 and 7. All other claims are rejected with their respective parent claim 1.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Parul Gupta whose telephone number is 571-272-5260. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, from 9:30 AM to 7 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Korzuch can be reached on 571-272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PHG
3/13/07

William Korzuch
WILLIAM KORZUCH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600